

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on June 24, 2010, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Claims 1-15 are currently pending.

I. Drawing Objections

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference characters not mentioned in the description: #152 of figure 1 and #300 of figure 3. The specification has been amended to add the reference characters #152 and #300 already identified in the drawings. No new matter is added. Accordingly, the drawing objection should be withdrawn.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference signs mentioned in the description: 80 and 1024. The specification has been amended to remove the reference signs 80 and 1024. Accordingly, the drawing objection should be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 to remove parentheses. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1 and 8 should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claim 2 to improve clarity. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kark et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0107761 A1) in view of Yanagimachi (U.S. Publication 2002/0059090 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as set forth below.

Claim 1 recites “receiving a description of a provider offering in business terms without any references to specific resources, said provider offering being distinct from a resource catalog, wherein said provider offering is input into a transformation component...wherein said resource catalog is input into the transformation component; mapping said description of said provider offering with said resource type information contained in said resource catalog and generating by the transformation component a customer specific service environment topology tree comprising the steps of: using said provider offering by the transformation component as a root node of a customer specific service environment topology tree to be generated, wherein said provider offering is distinct from said resource catalog”.

Support for this amendment is found in the first paragraph of page 7 of the originally filed specification and boxes 110 and 112 of FIG. 1.

The combined disclosures Kark and Yanagimachi fail to disclose the above features of claim 1. In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action cites to the Abstract and paragraph [0075] of Kark.

First, the Abstract of Kark states “Methods and associated systems for multi-layered channel marketing catalog generation and maintenance. A plurality of hierarchically related product/service catalogs are maintained so as to maintain commonality with regard to information contained in the catalogs and to permit customization at each layer. Information from a plurality of manufacturer catalogs are provided and integrated into a single master industry catalog Channel marketing partners of the several manufacturers extract information from the industry catalog for the particular manufacturers with whom they have established marketing agreements. The

extracted information is then presented as a channel partner catalog to customers/users of the channel partner. Resellers having established relationships with one or more channel partners extract information from the channel partners' catalogs to create a reseller's catalog. Still lower layers of the marketing channel extract information from the next higher layer catalog to generate their own custom layer catalog. Each layer catalog includes processing to periodically review the higher layer's catalog to identify new or revised information and may accept or reject the updates for inclusion in their layer. Revision index values are preferably used in each layered catalog to identify updates and additions. In the preferred embodiment, information is exchanged between the catalogs using standard XML messaging formats and protocols."

In an attempt to read on "receiving a description of a provider offering in business terms without any references to specific resources" recited in claim 1, the Office Action indicates "Abstract 'Information from a plurality of manufacturer catalog[s] are provided'". However, the Abstract of Kark (combined with Yanagimachi) fails to disclose "said provider offering being distinct from a resource catalog" as recited in claim 1. It appears that the Office Action reasons that the plurality of manufacturer catalogs (which are integrated into a single master industry catalog) in Kark are the "provider offering" recited in claim 1. However, Kark (combined with Yanagimachi) does not indicate that the manufacturer catalogs (i.e., the industry catalog) are distinct from any "provider offering". Moreover, Kark (combined with Yanagimachi) fails to disclose a "a provider offering in business terms without any references to specific resources" as recited in claim 1.

Second, paragraph [0075] of Kark states "FIG. 4 is a block diagram of a hierarchical catalog structure of the present invention reflecting the structure of e-commerce channel marketing. A plurality of manufacturer catalogs 402 are provided by producers of goods/services. Information from such manufacturer catalogs 402 is integrated into an industry master catalog 400. Channel partners of the several manufacturers download information from the industry master catalog 400 into their own channel partner master catalogs 404. Each channel partner loads information into its

channel partner master catalog 404 for each of the various manufacturers with whom the channel partner has a business relationship. Each channel partner storefront (or 'reseller') downloads information from a corresponding channel partner master catalog 404 into its own channel partner storefront catalog 406. Lastly, custom catalogs 408 may be created for particular markets or customers by extracting information from a corresponding channel partner storefront catalog 406."

In an attempt to read on "using said provider offering by the transformation component as a root node of a customer specific service environment topology tree to be generated, wherein said provider offering is distinct from said resource catalog" recited in claim 1, the Office Action indicates "par. 0075 'customer catalogs may be created for particular markets or customers by extracting information from a corresponding channel partner'". However, paragraph [0075] of Kark (combined with Yanagimachi) fails to disclose "the transformation component" "using said provider offering...as a root node" as recited in claim 1. Since Kark (combined with Yanagimachi) fails to disclose a "provider offering" that is distinct from the customer catalogs, Kark would not use the missing provider offering "as a root node of a...topology tree to be generated" by the transformation component.

Third, the combined disclosures of Kark and Yanagimachi are silent with respect to "wherein said provider offering is input into a transformation component...wherein said resource catalog is input into the transformation component" as recited in claim 1.

Yanagimachi does not compensate for the deficiencies of Kark. For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-7 and 15 are patentable over the combined disclosures of Kark and Yanagimachi.

Claim 8 recites "receiving a description of a provider offering in business terms without any references to specific resources, said provider offering being distinct from a resource catalog, wherein said provider offering is input into the transformation component; wherein said resource catalog is input into the transformation component...wherein said resource catalog is input into the transformation component".

The combined disclosures of Kark and Yanagimachi fail to disclose or render obvious the above features of claim 8. For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 8 and its dependent claims 9-14 are patentable over the combined disclosures of Kark and Yanagimachi.

IV. Conclusion

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and that the claims herein should be allowable to the Applicants. In the event the Examiner has any queries regarding the instantly submitted response, the undersigned respectfully request the courtesy of a telephone conference to discuss any matters in need of attention.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0463.

Respectfully Submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /Duane P. Minley/

Duane P. Minley
Registration No. 60,098
20 Church Street, 22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103-3207
Telephone: (404) 607-9991
Facsimile: (404) 607-9981
Customer No. 46429

Date: September 10, 2010